

Supreme Court U.S.
FILED

No. _____

05-727661-2005

In The OFFICE OF THE CLERK
Supreme Court of the United States

EVERYTHING FOR LOVE, INC.,
WENDY ROBBINS and JORLI McLAIN,

Petitioners,

v.

TENDER LOVING THINGS, INC.,

Respondent.

**On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari
To The Court Of Appeal Of California**

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

WARREN J. KRAUSS
(*Counsel of Record*)
FREDERICK D. BAKER
SEDGWICK, DETERT,
MORAN & ARNOLD LLP
One Market Plaza
Steuart Tower, 8th Floor
San Francisco, California
94105
Telephone: (415) 781-7900

KIRK C. JENKINS
SEDGWICK, DETERT,
MORAN & ARNOLD LLP
One N. Wacker Drive,
Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 641-9050

DONALD L. LENKSZUS
DONALD J. LENKSZUS, P.C.
P.O. Box 306
Carefree, Arizona 85377
Telephone: (602) 463-2010

Counsel for Petitioners

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Does a motion asking a state court to enter a judgment requiring the non-moving party, if it chooses to sell devices covered by a certain patent, to purchase them from the patentee's licensee, arise under the Federal patent laws and fall within the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal courts where there has been no determination as to the scope of the claims of the patent?

2. Where the owner of a federally registered trademark has abandoned use of the mark in connection with devices covered by a certain patent, but continues to use the mark in connection with other products, may a state court order the partial assignment of the trademark for purposes of the abandoned use only, without mentioning goodwill?

LISTING OF PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

The caption contains the names of all parties to this proceeding.

RULE 29.6 STATEMENT

Petitioner Everything For Love, Inc. does not have a parent corporation. No publicly held company owns 10% or more of petitioner's stock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
LISTING OF PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING	ii
RULE 29.6 STATEMENT	ii
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI	1
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	1
STATUTES INVOLVED	1
INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND	4
A. EFL's U.S. Patent No. 6,450,980	4
B. TLT Steals EFL's Product and Attempts to Appropriate EFL's Goodwill	5
C. The Arbitration	5
D. The Federal Lawsuit	7
E. This Litigation	7
F. The Mediation	7
G. Negotiations for a Final Settlement Break Down	8
II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND	9
A. TLT's Motion to Enforce Settlement	9
B. The Trial Court's Order and Judgment	9
C. EFL Challenges the Trial Court's Subject Matter Jurisdiction and the Validity of the Purported Trademark Assignment	10

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
D. The Court of Appeal Affirms the Judgment.....	11
E. EFL Petitions for Rehearing Based Upon the Court of Appeal's Misstatement of Fact and Legal Errors.....	12
F. The California Supreme Court Denies EFL's Petition for Review	13
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	13
I. THE COURT OF APPEAL'S DECISION EXACERBATES CONFUSION IN THE LAW OF EXCLUSIVE FEDERAL PATENT JURISDICTION WHICH IS SO PERVASIVE THAT WRIGHT AND MILLER'S TREATISE CALLS THE AREA "ONE OF THE DARKEST CORRIDORS OF THE LAW OF FEDERAL COURTS AND FEDERAL JURISDICTION"	13
A. Civil Actions Which Arise Under the Federal Patent Laws Are Subject to the Exclusive Jurisdiction of the Federal Courts	13
B. A State Law Claim Arises Under the Federal Patent Laws When the Plaintiff's Claim Necessarily Depends Upon the Resolution of a Substantial Question of Federal Law	14
1. State Law Contract Claims Held to Arise Under the Federal Patent Laws ...	14
2. State Law Contract Claims Held Not to Arise Under the Federal Patent Laws	17

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

	Page
C. By Focusing on the Contract Issues and Disregarding the Fundamental Nature of The Case, The Court of Appeal Has Invented a State Court Claim for Patent Infringement and Shrunk Federal Jurisdiction to Nothing	22
D. Because It Amounts to a State-Law Patent, the Judgment is Invalid Pursuant to the Supremacy Clause	24
II. THE COURT OF APPEAL'S DECISION AFFIRMING THE ASSIGNMENT OF A FEDERALLY REGISTERED TRADEMARK WHICH THE COURT CLAIMED HAD NO ATTENDANT GOODWILL CONFLICTS WITH FEDERAL LAW AND NUMEROUS DECISIONS OF THE CIRCUITS.....	26
A. A Trademark is Not A Free-Standing Property Right Which Can Be Assigned or Transferred.....	27
B. Because There Was No Finding That Goodwill Was Transferred in Connection with Lacey/365 Patents, The Court of Appeal's Affirmance of the Assignment of EFL's Trademark Was Erroneous.....	29
CONCLUSION.....	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
Additive Controls v. Flowdata, 986 F.2d 476 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	15, 16, 23
Air Prods. and Chemicals, Inc. v. Reichhold Chemicals, Inc., 755 F.2d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	20
Ausherman v. Stump, 643 F.2d 715 (10th Cir. 1981)	19
Ballard Medical Prods. v. Wright, 823 F.2d 527 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	18
Beanstalk Group, Inc. v. AM General Corp., 283 F.3d 856 (7th Cir. 2002)	27
Beauty Time, Inc. v. Vu Skin Systems, Inc., 118 F.3d 140 (3d Cir. 1997)	27
Berni v. International Gourmet Restaurants of America, Inc., 838 F.2d 642 (2nd Cir. 1988)	27
Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Craft Boats, 489 U.S. 141 (1989)	24, 25, 26
Christianson v. Colt Indus. Operating Corp., 486 U.S. 800 (1988)	14, 17
Combs v. Plough, Inc., 681 F.2d 469 (6th Cir. 1982)	19
Compco Corp. v. Day-Brite Lighting, Inc., 376 U.S. 234 (1964)	24
Deering Precision Instr., LLC v. Vector Distribution Systems, Inc., 347 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	23
E&J Gallo Winery v. Gallo Cattle Co., 967 F.2d 1280 (9th Cir. 1992)	27
Hunter Douglas, Inc. v. Harmonic Design, Inc., 153 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	15, 23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
Intl. Cosmetics Exchange, Inc. v. Gapardis Health & Beauty, Inc., 303 F.3d 1242 (11th Cir. 2002)	28, 29
Jim Arnold Corp. v. Hydrotech Systems, Inc., 109 F.3d 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	20, 21
Kunkel v. Topmaster Intl., Inc., 906 F.2d 693 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	19, 20, 21
Lockett v. Delpark, 270 U.S. 496 (1926).....	17, 18, 19, 20, 21
Marshak v. Green, 746 F.2d 927 (2nd Cir. 1984)	27, 28
Pepsico, Inc. v. Grapette Co., 416 F.2d 285 (8th Cir. 1969)	28
Pixton v. B&B Plastics, Inc., 291 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	21, 22
Premier Dental Prods. Co. v. Darby Dental Supply Co., 794 F.2d 850 (3d Cir. 1986)	27
Scherbatskoy v. Halliburton, 125 F.3d 288 (5th Cir. 1997)	17
Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Stiffel Co., 376 U.S. 225 (1964)	24, 25, 26
Sugar Busters LLC v. Brennan, 177 F.3d 258 (5th Cir. 1999)	27, 28
U.S. Valves, Inc. v. Dray, 212 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	14, 15, 19
University of West Virginia, Board of Trustees v. Vanvoorhies, 278 F.3d 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	16, 17
Visa, U.S.A., Inc. v. Birmingham Trust Nat'l Bank, 696 F.2d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 1982)	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
Vittoria North America, LLC v. Euro-Asia Imports Inc., 278 F.3d 1076 (10th Cir. 2001).....	28
Wilson v. Sandford, 51 U.S. (10 How.) 99 (1850).....	17, 18, 19, 20, 21
 FEDERAL STATUTES	
28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).....	1
28 U.S.C. § 1338	10, 13, 23
35 U.S.C. § 102(d).....	11
 TREATISES	
C. Wright, A. Miller & E. Cooper, 13B Fed. Prac. & Proc. Juris. 2d § 3582	2
 OTHER AUTHORITIES	
Donald S. Chisum, <i>The Allocation of Jurisdiction Between State and Federal Courts in Patent Liti- gation</i> , 46 Wash. L. Rev. 633 (1971).....	2

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Everything for Love, Inc., Wendy Robbins and Jorli McLain respectfully petition for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the California Court of Appeal.

OPINIONS BELOW

The order and judgment of the California Superior Court are not reported. Neither the opinion of the California Court of Appeal, the order of the Court of Appeal denying rehearing, nor the order of the California Supreme Court denying review are included in the official reporter. However, the opinion of the California Court of Appeal is available on-line at 2005 WL 902648 and at 2005 Cal. App. Unpub. LEXIS 3470. The order of the Court of Appeal denying rehearing is available on-line at 2005 Cal. LEXIS 6862. The order of the California Supreme Court denying review is available on-line at 2005 Cal. LEXIS 7868.

JURISDICTION

The opinion and judgment of the California Court of Appeal were filed April 20, 2005. The Court of Appeal's order denying rehearing was filed May 16, 2005. The order of the California Supreme Court denying review was filed July 13, 2005. The Court has jurisdiction to review the judgment of the California Court of Appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

STATUTES INVOLVED

Because the relevant statutes, 15 U.S.C. § 1060 and 28 U.S.C. § 1338, are lengthy, they are printed in full in the appendix hereto ("Pet. App.") at 48-49.

INTRODUCTION

In this petition, petitioners Everything for Love, Inc., Wendy Robbins and Jorli McLain (collectively, "EFL")

respectfully ask this Court to bring order and coherence to what Professors Wright, Miller and Cooper describe as a "very subtle" issue – "one of the darkest corridors of the law of federal courts and federal jurisdiction" – the question of when an action "arises under" the Federal patent laws for purposes of triggering exclusive Federal jurisdiction. C. Wright, A. Miller & E. Cooper, 13B Fed. Prac. & Proc. Juris. 2d § 3582, pp. 307 & n. 11, quoting Donald S. Chisum, *The Allocation of Jurisdiction between State and Federal Courts in Patent Litigation*, 46 Wash. L. Rev. 633, 639 (1971).

In settlement of litigation between the parties, EFL and respondent Tender Loving Things, Inc. ("TLT") entered into an agreement.¹ The agreement provided that if EFL purchased any head massager devices covered by a certain patent, owned by a business associate of TLT and supposedly exclusively licensed by TLT (the "Lacey/365 patent"), it would do so from TLT. The agreement is silent on what constitutes a device covered by the Lacey/365 patent. On TLT's motion, the California Superior Court entered that agreement as a judgment. The California Court of Appeal affirmed, and the California Supreme Court denied review.

Over the past hundred years, the lower courts have struggled to apply the Supreme Court's teachings on the issue of when an action arises under the Federal patent laws. In the process, two distinct and fundamentally irreconcilable lines of authority have arisen, forming the "dark corridor" of which Wright, Miller and Cooper write, sometimes holding that what appear on their face to be state-law contract actions do arise under the federal patent laws, and sometimes that they do not.

¹ Before the California state courts, EFL vigorously disputed the existence of an enforceable agreement on numerous grounds, including fraud and mistake. However, since the purported agreement was challenged exclusively on state-law grounds, the validity of the agreement is not before this Court.

The California Court of Appeal's decision greatly exacerbates that conflict. The Court of Appeal's decision means that the mere presence of a contract in the case is enough to convert what is fundamentally a patent infringement claim – whether or not EFL sold devices “covered” by the Lacey/365 patent – into a claim cognizable in state court, without any determination as to what is “covered” by the Lacey/365 patent. The Court of Appeal's decision opens an avenue by which nearly all patent litigation can be diverted into the state courts, completely frustrating the constitutional imperative and Congress' intent that the law of patents be propounded on a uniform basis nationwide.

The Court of Appeal's decision also conflicts with a second line of authority. The Supreme Court has made it clear that any state-law system which conflicts with Federal goals in the area of patent law is preempted by the Supremacy Clause. In this case, the Court of Appeal's decision cobbles together the equivalent of a state-law claim for patent infringement, backed by the courts' power of levying contempt sanctions. For the state court to enforce a judgment of what is “covered” by a patent inherently allows the state court to interpret the patent claims and scope of patent coverage in frustration of the Federal goals of uniform patent laws and patent interpretation. The Court of Appeal's decision mandates that the state court will interpret and enforce federal patents, thereby setting up state court interpretation of patents and frustrating the federal interest in uniform patent law. The Court of Appeal's judgment is in excess of its jurisdiction.

Finally, the Supreme Court has held that the states lack the authority to prohibit the copying of inventions and processes which Federal law has determined are unpatentable. To avoid running afoul of this principle, any protection given by state law to a patented product would have to parallel Federal patent protection and immediately terminate if the patent were declared invalid, whether by the Federal courts or the United States Patent